

AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE UNDER 37 CFR § 1.111

Serial Number: 10/670,982

Filing Date: September 25, 2003

Title: SOFT BITS NORMALIZATION APPARATUS, METHOD, AND SYSTEM

Page 2

Dkt: 80107.025US1

IN THE DRAWINGS

Three sheets of formalized replacement drawings are enclosed herewith.

REMARKS

Applicant has reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on January 17, 2007, and the references cited therewith.

Claims 5, 6, 8-10, 15, 18, 19, 21, 22, and 26 are amended, claims 1-4, 7, 14, 16, 20, 23, and 27 are canceled, and claims 30 and 31 are added; as a result, claims 5, 6, 8-13, 15, 17-19, 21, 22, 24-26, and 28-31 are now pending in this application.

Claim Objections

Claims 1-3 and 9 were objected to because of the following informalities:

- a. In claims 1-3, the phrase “a signal” and “the signal” is suggested to be changed to “a first signal” and “the first signal”.
- b. In claim 9, the phrase “the listed actions” is suggested to be changed to “a list of actions”.

Claims 1-3 have been canceled, and the limitations thereof have been incorporated in claims 5 and 6. The suggested amendment for claims 1-3 has been incorporated in claims 5 and 6. Claim 9 has been amended as suggested. Applicant believes the objections to claims 1-3 and 9 have been overcome.

35 USC § 101 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 18-21 were rejected under 35 USC § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 20 has been canceled. Claims 18, 19, and 21 have been amended to recite a computer-readable medium. Applicant believes this rejection has been overcome by the amendment.

35 USC § 112 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 18-21 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant

regards as the invention. Applicant believes this rejection has been overcome by the amendments described in the above section entitled *35 USC § 101 Rejection of the Claims*.

35 USC §103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1, 2, 8, and 9 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corbaton et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0186761) in view of Driesen et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0111525). Claims 1 and 2 have been canceled. Claim 8 has been amended to depend on claim 5, which was found to be allowable if rewritten form. Amended claim 9 depends on claim 8. Claims 8 and 9 are believed to be in condition for allowance at least by virtue of dependency.

Claims 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corbaton et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0186761) in view of Driesen et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0111525), and further in view of Zvonar (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0099310). Claims 3 and 4 have been canceled rendering this rejection moot.

Claim 7 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corbaton et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0186761) in view of Driesen et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0111525) in further view of Zvonar (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0099310), and in further view of Hwang (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0085649). Claim 7 has been canceled rendering this rejection moot.

Claims 10, 11, 14, 16, and 17 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindoff (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,320) in view of Driesen et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0111525). Claim 10 has been amended to include a limitation similar to the limitations of claim 5, which was found to allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 14 and 16 have been canceled. Claims 11 and 17 depend on claim 10 and are believed to be in condition for allowance at least by virtue of dependency.

Claim 15 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindoff (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,320) in view of Driesen et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0111525), and in further view of Hwang (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0085649). Claim 15 has been amended to depend on claim 10, and is believed to be in condition for allowance at least by virtue of dependency.

Claims 12 and 13 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindoff (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,320) in view of Driesen et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0111525), and in further view of Jalali et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,099,384). Claims 12 and 13 depend on claim 10, and are believed to be in condition for allowance at least by virtue of dependency.

Claim 18 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corbaton et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0186761) in view of Tanada (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0037262). Claim 18 has been amended to include the limitations of claim 20. The rejection of claim 20 as filed is believed to be overcome as described above regarding the rejections under 35 USC § 101 and 35 USC § 112. Accordingly, applicants believe claim 18 is in condition for allowance.

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Corbaton et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2002/0186761) in view of Tanada (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0037262), and in further view of Driesen et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0111525). Claim 19 depends on claim 18, and is believed to be in condition for allowance at least by virtue of dependency.

Claims 22, 24, 26, and 28 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindoff (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,320) in view of Tanada (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0037262). Claims 22 and 26 have been amended to include limitations similar to the limitations of claim 5, which was found to allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 24 and 28 depend on claims 22 and 26, respectively, and are believed to be in condition for allowance at least by virtue of dependency.

Claims 23 and 27 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindoff (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,320) in view of Tanada (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0037262), and in further view of Driesen et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0111525). Claims 23 and 27 have been canceled, rendering this rejection moot.

Claims 25 and 29 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lindoff (U.S. Patent No. 6,449,320) in view of Tanada (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0037262), and in further view of Jalali et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,099,384). Claims 25 and 29 depend on claims 22 and 26, respectively, and are believed to be in condition for allowance at least by virtue of dependency.

New Claims

Claims 30 and 31 have been added. Claims 30 and 31 depend on claim 6, and are believed to be in condition for allowance at least by virtue of dependency.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 5 and 6 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but were indicated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Claims 5 and 6 have been amended to include all the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney (952-473-8800) to facilitate prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

EYAL KRUPKA

By his Representatives,

Customer Number: 45445

Telephone Number: 952-473-8800

Date March 20, 2007

By Dana B. LeMoine
Dana B. LeMoine
Reg. No. 40,062

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 20 day of March, 2007.

Kyrstih Ryan
Name

Kyrstih Ryan
Signature